REMARKS

Claims 1 – 27 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1 – 27 are presented for reconsideration.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 11, and 13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.*, (U.S. 2002/0042819) in view of *Sadri, et al.* (U.S. 2005/0027705). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relied on *Sadri, et al.* for disclosing the display of "search results for lodging properties on a map wherein the user can interact with the map to display substantially real-time (i.e., dynamic) information regarding the lodging property" citing paragraph 54 of the published patent application. In the paragraph cited by the Examiner, *Sadri, et al.* discloses that hovering a mouse cursor over an icon allows the user to view a summary of pertinent information concerning the item represented by the icon. *Sadri, et al.* further discloses in the same paragraph that for a hotel, the "summary may include the hotel name, address, room rate, or special offers available at this time." This disclosure does not constitute a teaching of displaying substantially real-time, dynamic information when a user interacts with the map. The items included in the hotel summary in *Sadri, et al.* are substantially static information regarding a lodging property. Special offers may only apply for a limited period of time, e.g., June through August at selected lodging properties. Such information is updated occasionally on an as needed basis, and thus is substantially static. In contrast, in the present invention, both dynamic and static information are provided when the user moves a cursor over an icon for a lodging property.

In addition, *Sadri, et al.* claims priority to provisional patent application 60/471,822, filed on May 20, 2003. Thus the earliest effective filing date for *Sadri, et al.* is May 20, 2003. The present application claims priority to provisional patent application 60/475,571 filed on June 3, 2003, which is the constructive reduction to practice date. However, the present invention was conceived and reduced to practice at a date earlier than May 20, 2003, as evidenced by the Rule 131 Declaration of Mr. Jeffery C. Smith, General Counsel and Senior Vice president of Worldspan, the Assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the present application. Attached to Mr. Smith's Declaration is the Worldspan Invention Disclosure Form prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Assignee on February 10, 2003. The invention disclosure form indicates that conception and reduction to practice had already occurred when Applicant submitted the disclosure to the Assignee. Consequently, *Sadri, et al.* cannot be combined with other references to reject the pending claims. The Declaration of Mr. Jeffery C. Smith could not have been submitted previously, since the *Sadri, et al.* reference was first applied in the most recent Official Action.

Claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1. Therefore, in view of the preceding remarks and the Declaration of Mr. Jeffery C. Smith, the rejection of Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 11 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.,* (U.S. 2002/0042819) in view of *Sadri, et al.* (U.S. 2005/0027705) should be withdrawn and these claims should be allowed. Claim 13 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* in view of *Sadri, et al.* and *DeLorme, et al.* (2003/0182052). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Specifically, *Sadri, et al.* cannot be combined with other references to reject the pending claims. In addition, in paragraph 197 cited by the Examiner, *DeLorme, et al.* discloses plotting points of interest retrieved within circles of a specified radius centered on geographic points which are essentially road or highway intersections. In Applicant's invention, it is the average position of the lodging properties that is used as the basis for centering of the displayed map, whereas in *DeLorme, et al.*, major road intersections are displayed along with points of interest that are within a specified radius of each of the major road intersections. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable for this additional reason.

The Examiner rejected Claim 12 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.*, in view of *Sadri, et al.*, and further in view of *Jones* (U.S. 7,082,400). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Specifically, *Sadri, et al.* cannot be combined with other references to reject the pending claims. In addition, *Jones, et al.* discloses a system that recommends lodging properties to the user on a series of web pages (note the "Next" button in Fig. 4B). The user could have to click through a series of displays such as shown in Fig. 4B before deciding on a lodging property. Furthermore, *Jones, et al.* discloses a central reservation system including a travel database that contains many different types of data including flight information, hotel information, ground transportation information, etc. that may include data from multiple sources

such as servers on the world wide web (col. 3, ll. 32 – 50). In contrast, Applicant's invention dynamically displays hotel information by a user's indication (mouseover) of a particular lodging property on the map display, enabling the user to compare, select and initiate a reservation via the computer reservation system of the particular lodging property, all on the same webpage. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable for this additional reason.

The Examiner rejected Claims 14 – 16, 18, 22, and 23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert* in view of *Sadri, et al.*, and *Jones*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1 concerning the teachings and use of *Sadri, et al.* as a reference. With *Sadri, et al.* removed as a reference, neither *Reichert* nor *Jones* teaches "displaying substantially dynamic information regarding the particular lodging property indicated by the user, wherein the substantially dynamic information is provided in substantially real-time so as to be substantially current." Therefore, Claim 14 is allowable over the other applied references. Claims 15 – 16, 18, and 22 depend from Claim 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 23 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

The Examiner rejected Claims 17 and 19 – 21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* in view of *Sadri, et al.* and *Jones, et al.* and further in view of *DeLorme, et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 17 depends from claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14. Furthermore, claim 17 recites the same limitation as claim 6. Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above for the

allowability of claim 6. Claims 19 – 21 depend, either directly or directly, from Claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim14.

Claims 24 – 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.*, in view of *Sadri, et al., DeLorme, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040), *Jones, et al.*, and *DeLorme, et al.* (US 2003/0182052). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding Claim 24, Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1 concerning the teachings and use of *Sadri, et al.* as a reference. With *Sadri, et al.* removed as a reference, none of the other applied references teaches "displaying in the dialog box ... substantially dynamic information regarding the particular lodging property indicated by the user, wherein the substantially dynamic information is provided in substantially real-time so as to be substantially current." Therefore, Claim 24 is allowable over the other applied references. Claim 25 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 24 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

Regarding Claim 26, Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1 concerning the teachings and use of *Sadri, et al.* as a reference. With *Sadri, et al.* removed as a reference, none of the other applied references teaches "displaying in the dialog box ... substantially dynamic information regarding the particular lodging property indicated by the user, wherein the substantially dynamic information is provided in substantially real-time so as to be substantially current." Therefore, Claim 26 is allowable over the other applied references. Claim 27 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 26 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26.

In view of the above remarks, and the Declaration of Mr. Jeffery C. Smith to remove *Sadri, et al.* as a reference, it is submitted that the claim rejections of the Examiner have been properly addressed and the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully request that this response after final rejection be entered, and that the pending claims be allowed. Such action at an early date is respectfully solicited. It is also requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below should this response not be deemed to place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

_8/31/07_

Date
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
(404) 888-7412 (Telephone)
(404) 870-2405 (Facsimile)

John J. Timar
Registration No. 32,497
Attorney for Applicant